First, Cordia does not disclose a system in which "the detecting, accelerating, transferring, and decelerating steps" are repeated for each subsequent blank. As disclosed in Cordia, as discussed in applicant's response filed October 26, 2005 and as acknowledged by the Examiner in the current Office Action, the phasing conveyors 22 and 25 of Cordia are either accelerated, or decelerated, or maintained at the same velocity as a result of the detecting step. Thus, as each article in the Cordia system is detected, the phasing conveyors are either accelerated or decelerated or maintained at the same velocity in response to the detecting step. Thus, for each article in the Cordia system there is a detection, followed by an acceleration or a deceleration or a maintenance at the same velocity and then followed by a transfer. The cycle of (1) detecting, (2) accelerating, decelerating or maintenance at the same velocity and (3) transfer are then repeated for each successive article. In other words, there is no additional deceleration (or acceleration) step following the transfer step in Cordia. In Cordia, it appears that as soon as the transfer is made, the phasing conveyor maintains its same speed until the detection of the next article is made. This detecting step is then again, depending upon the position of the detected article, either accelerated or decelerated or maintained at the same velocity, followed again by the transfer. Thus, the Cordia patent is clearly distinguishable from the present invention for this reason.

Second, in direct contrast to the above-described operation of Cordia and as clearly required by claim 9, claim 9 does require that the first conveyor to always be accelerated from the first to the second velocity in response to the detecting step for the given blank and for each of the subsequent blanks. Then, after transfer of the given blank, the first conveyor is decelerated to the first velocity, after which the cycle of detecting, accelerating, transferring and decelerating are repeated for each subsequent blank. Thus, the first conveyor, for each given blank and for each subsequent blank is subject to four-step process of a detecting step, an acceleration step, a transfer step and a deceleration step, after which the process is repeated for each subsequent blank. As discussed above, this process is clearly different than the three-step process of Cordia in which there is no deceleration (or acceleration) step following the transfer step. Instead, the next article is merely detected and the speed of the phasing conveyor adjusted accordingly.

It is assumed that the Examiner's reason for stating that claim 9 does not require the first conveyor to always be accelerated in response to the detecting step is because of the

"decelerating" step in claim 9 which requires the first conveyor to be decelerated to the first velocity "after said accelerating step and in response to detecting the position of said given blank". However, as discussed above, this decelerating step is merely the last step of the four-step process of detecting, accelerating, transferring and decelerating which are applied to the given blank and to each subsequent blank. In the method of claim 9, there is only one detecting step for each blank. In response to this detecting step for each blank, the first conveyor is first accelerated to the second velocity and then after the transfer step, the first conveyor is decelerated back to the first velocity.

Third, the Examiner states that claim 9 only requires that the first conveyor be accelerated in response to the detecting step "for a number of subsequent blanks". This is not true. There is no language in claim 9 that requires the first conveyor to be accelerated in response to the detecting step "only for a number of subsequent blanks". In contrast, the last step of claim 9 requires "repeating said detecting, accelerating, transferring and decelerating steps for each said subsequent blank" (emphasis added). Further, in the "decelerating" step language "subsequent blank" is defined as being "immediately adjacent to said given blank". Thus, independent claim 9 requires the detecting step, the accelerating step, the transferring step and the decelerating step to be applied to the given blank and to each of the subsequent blanks.

In view of the fact that no amendments have been made to the claims, it is submitted that this Response is proper under Rule 116. Entry of this Response and reconsideration of the rejection of independent claim 9 and dependent claims 10-13 and 15 is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing comments.

If there are any questions regarding the teachings of Cordia or the above comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the Undersigned in order to expedite the prosecution of this application. The Examiner is also respectfully requested to act promptly with

respect to this Request for Reconsideration so that applicant will have sufficient time to consider

the filing of an appeal or other action prior to the final deadline for responding to the final Action

of January 12, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
Customer Number 25763

Date: _April 12, 2006_   By: _David N. Fronek_

David N. Fronek, Reg. No. 25,678
(612) 340-2629
Suite 1500
50 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498
(612) 340-2629